

Capitol Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

October 17, 2007

9:00 a.m. Noon

Hoover Building – Level A – Conf. Rooms 7 & 8

This regular meeting of the Capitol Planning Commission was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

Members Present

Brice Oakley, Chair	Molly Clause	Senator Matt McCoy
Catherine Brown, Vice-Chair	Elizabeth Isaacson	Representative Mark Davitt
Paul Carlson, Secretary	Carl Voss	Representative Ralph Watts

Members Absent

Scott Brown – Excused
Senator James Seymour

Dept. of Administrative Services (DAS) Staff Present

Mollie Anderson, Director—DAS
Dean Ibsen—DAS, General Services Enterprise, Vertical Infrastructure Program
Nancy Williams—DAS, General Services Enterprise
Nicholas Smith—DAS, General Services Enterprise, Vertical Infrastructure Program
Deb Madison-Levi—DAS
Laura Riordan—DAS
Tera Granger—DAS
Mark Johnson - DAS

Others Present for All or Portions of the Meeting

Mark Willemssen, Legislature
Theresa Kehoe—Senate Democrats
Eddie Sauls—Iowa Workforce Development
Scott Weiser—Iowa Motor Truck Association
Rev. Chet Guinn—Peace Makers Group
M.J. Dolan—Iowa Association of Community College Trustees
Jeffrey A. Krausman—Dickinson Law Firm
Donald L. Seymour—Durrant Architects Engineers
Linda Clausen – Iowa Association of Community College Trustees
Sharon Worthington – Vocational Rehabilitation
Mike Lewis – Durrant Group
David Boyd – Judicial
Marcia Tanniman – LSA Fiscal
James Ellwanger – Artist – Shattering Silence
Rod Boshart – Cedar Rapids Gazette

Summary of Proceedings

Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 9:00a.m.

Meeting Overview and Approval of Agenda – Action Item

The agenda was approved with one change.

MOTION - Elizabeth Isaacson moved to approve the agenda. Molly Clause seconded the motion. Agenda approved.

Request for Comments during the Meeting

Approval of Minutes of August 21, 2007 and September 11, 2007

Minutes of the previous meetings were approved with minor editing corrections.

MOTION - Molly Clause moved to approve the amended minutes of August 21, 2007. Carl Voss seconded the motion. Minutes stand approved.

MOTION - Carl Voss moved to approve the amended minutes of the September 11, 2007 meeting. Elizabeth Isaacson seconded the motion. Minutes stand approved.

Iowa Association of Community College Trustees Building

*Update on Negotiations and Building Design (IACCT and IMTA Representatives and Staff).
Status of Negotiations*

Review of Design Changes and Project Schedule

MOTION - Carl Voss moved to approve the revised site plan which would include exchange of property as outlined and if that does not reach agreement on Friday, October 19, 2007, then we revert to our original site approved in July, 2007. Molly Clause seconded the motion.

Roll call vote. Motion carried unanimously.

Task Force Reports

Draft Policy for Monuments (Monuments and Memorials Task Force). Review of Draft Document, Outstanding Questions, Discussion and Next Steps.

Fountain Report (Fountain Task Force) Update and Next Steps

Capitol Complex Monuments

Shattering Silence Update. Consideration of Alternative Sites and Next Steps

MOTION: Elizabeth Isaacson made the motion to approve placing the Shattering Silence Sculpture within the circled area on the aerial photo west of the Japanese Bell on the crest of the hill. Cathy Brown seconded the motion.

Roll call vote. Motion carried.

Workers' Monument Update

Overview of Final Plans, 28E Agreement and Construction Schedule.

Bicycles and Bicycle parking on Capitol Complex

Capitol Requests/Five Year Modernization Plan for Capitol Complex

Construction Update

Parking Lot Improvements

Capitol Building Interior and East Steps

West Capitol Terrace Phase 2

Newly Funded Miscellaneous Construction Projects

New Office Building/Parking Structure and New IUB/OCA Building update

New Office Building

Visitors Center – Carl Voss asked for an update.

Capitol Planning Commission Annual Report for 2007

Other Business

Meeting Adjourned

Minutes of Proceedings

Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 9:00a.m.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Brice Oakley at 9:00 a.m., followed by roll call by Nancy Williams and introductions.

Meeting Overview and Approval of Agenda – Action Item

The agenda was approved with one change.

Chairman Oakley asked for any additions or corrections to the agenda. He said that under 9:45, Comments and Recommendations on Capitol Requests the time should read 11:00 a.m.

MOTION - Elizabeth Isaacson moved to approve the agenda. Molly Clause seconded the motion. Agenda approved.

Request for Comments during the Meeting

Chairman Oakley outlined procedures for receiving questions and comments during the meeting and for voting.

Approval of Minutes of August 21, 2007 and September 11, 2007

Minutes of the previous meetings were approved with minor editing corrections.

MOTION - Molly Clause moved to approve the amended minutes of August 21, 2007. Carl Voss seconded the motion. Minutes stand approved.

MOTION - Carl Voss moved to approve the amended minutes of the September 11, 2007 meeting. Elizabeth Isaacson seconded the motion. Minutes stand approved.

Iowa Association of Community College Trustees Building

*Update on Negotiations and Building Design (IACCT and IMTA Representatives and Staff).
Status of Negotiations*

DAS Director Mollie Anderson stated several discussions have been held between IMTA and IACCT of which a member of the Commission (Carl Voss) was present. IMTA had a request

asking the State to consider moving the proposed parcel of land that the State was trading to IACCT forty additional feet. Director Anderson stated the request was considered and decided against a move of eighty feet but has offered to move the parcel to be traded forty feet. This decision is based upon the State's desire to have adequate land for various events in the area and the sledding hill. IMTA concluded the negotiations IMTA has a parcel of land in the southeast corner of their property that they will exchange for a parcel of land equal to the value of the parcel of land created as a result of moving the IACCT building forty feet. It is a small forty foot frontage triangle, non-buildable lot and IMTA have to agree in writing, that it is their desire to give the State a commitment to exchange land by Friday (October 19, 2007). If the State's land is worth more than IMTA's parcel of land when it is independently appraised, IMTA will need to pay the cash value difference. If IMTA's land is more than the State's, then the State would agree to a parcel of land equal the exact value of the small triangle to exchange with them.

Director Anderson stated appraisals could take three to four weeks to complete. That will be a separate exchange between the State and IMTA and would have to go before the Executive Council and the Capitol Planning Commission to finally be approved. In an exchange the law provides for the approval of the Executive Council. The deal will be separate from the exchange with IACCT.

Director Anderson continued at this point in time, they are on track to approve the IACCT exchange of property for their piece of property currently located on Locust Street. The next meeting of the Executive Council is October 22, 2007. The Community College will be paying the State \$75,000 in addition to the property they currently own for a one acre parcel which has been moved 40 foot and they will be able to begin the process of design.

The Commission is asked to approve both sites, 1) The original proposal that the Commission approved previously which includes the triangle and the other parcel of land, 2) The other site that would be moved 40 foot. Director Anderson states IACCT can proceed and the State can proceed with the exchange at the Executive Council on October 22, 2007.

Director Anderson stated we have finally reached an agreement between all the parties that will allow for the exchange the property with IACCT and satisfy the desire of the IMTA to have the visual site of the Capitol protected.

Chairman Oakley stated in both proposals:

Proposal A – Move forty feet and then the disposal of the forty foot triangle under some circumstance.

Proposal B – The original deal with the site plan which had already been approved by the Commission and no move to the east.

Director Anderson advised the expenses of redoing surveys, abstracts, appraisals, etc., IMTA will agree to reimburse the State for the costs. Chairman Oakley noted that would be included in Proposal A which is moving to the east.

MJ Dolan, Executive Director of the Iowa Association of Community Colleges, stated Director Anderson has done an excellent job of summarizing where this stands with IACCT. Ms. Dolan stated IACCT is willing to work to make this work.

Jeff Krauseman, representing IACCT, asked to bring the Commission up to date on how they came to this conclusion. He stated they met following the Commission meeting on September 11, 2007. As a group, IMTA and IACCT representatives, discussed the possible redesign of this site in order to meet the concerns of the parties. The decision was to retain a one acre size parcel and draw the boundary line to fit the one acre total property. He stated when they drew the line for the benefit of IMTA, one acre will require a move of forty-five feet

Mr. Krauseman stated as a result of the discussion with the IMTA representatives, IACCT has re-designed the layout of the building to accommodate the one acre parcel which is now a total of forty-five feet further east. They will draw a line and will not construct parking west of this line to protect the IMTA view as it looks to the Capitol Complex.

Mr. Krauseman stated they would like for this to go forward, and hope this works for IMTA, but if it doesn't they are prepared to go back to what the Commission approved in July and move forward without a change in site plan. IACCT is ready to drill holes in the ground for geo-thermal testing. This is a green heat source and they would like to do it; however, it is very expensive. Mr. Krauseman stated they need to come to some finalization on these sites to know where to start drilling. IACCT asks for approval of the two approaches with the amendment that it is actually forty-five feet.

Review of Design Changes and Project Schedule

Mr. Seymour with Durrant Architects referred Commission members to page three of the handout (attached) entitled "Site Plan (Land Allocation)" for discussion. The document was generated as a result of the conversation after the last Capitol Planning Commission meeting. The drawings show the boundaries

Mr. Seymour noted IACCT re-oriented the building to face the Capitol and in addition, changed the building so the Board Room faces the downtown area and allows the majority of the parking lot and the east side. The entrance area is on the northeast side. He stated an outside staircase on the east edge will take care of the grade change. He noted there is parking on the side next to the front door now

Mr. Seymour stated they have also added a drop-off behind the property line which was incorporated with the shift of the building to the east. They added a retaining wall on the east that mirrors the curb drive which will help take care of the grade change. After approval of the site plan, they will finalize the grade changes toward the parking at the lower end. He noted they have also located the trash on the far southeast corner away from any views or any entrances. The electrical transformer will probably be relocated to the east side of the building tucked behind the staircase area on the lower level.

Mr. Seymour noted the loop drive was put in for accessibility of fire and rescue. This will also minimize directional traffic.

Because of the shift, IACCT has adjusted the schedule. IACCT is looking to the Commission today to proceed so they can implement the proposed schedule.

Carl Voss noted this puts IACCT in a rental status for longer than had originally been planned. Director Anderson stated the State would accommodate for this in the original agreement.

Representative Watts stated the IACCT area will be the same size as it was previously and the \$75,000 discussed is the difference in value between the property on Locust Street and the appraisal of the one acre. MJ Dolan responded this is correct, stating when the original appraisal was completed between the Locust Street property at the end of the West Terrace and the land the State was willing to exchange, IACCT will pay the State \$75,000 to obtain the property.

Director Anderson advised the State will re-appraise the triangle that is left which will be exchanged with IMTA. It is important the appraisal be current for the Executive Council.

Scott Weiser advised the size of the triangle in discussion is 9,993 square foot.

Chairman Oakley asked if the schedule contemplates the zoning and the retaining wall, with regard to the sledding hill and is this a safety concern? IACCT advised they will be looking at safety concerns noting it is important to make sure it is protected. The height of the retaining wall has not been determined until more detailed site analysis is completed.

Cathy Brown asked about the difference of the forty or forty-five feet, does that affect the \$75,000 amount? Director Anderson stated the \$75,000 does not have anything to do with that parcel of land. The \$75,000 is the difference between the value of the Locust Street property and the one acre site the State will trade.

Cathy Brown asked what the elevation will be for the façade facing the Capitol. IACCT indicated this will be changed since we will be looking at a window package facing the Capitol. IACCT stated they recognize they will need to come back to the Commission for a building plan approval process.

Scott Weiser, President and CEO of IMTA noted Director Anderson's comments outline the current state of the negotiations. Mr. Weiser stated IMTA is a volunteer organization asked to enter into a contractual situation with the State on short notice, noting IMTA will do their best to do that by Friday, October 19, 2007. IMTA in general, is in agreement with the terms. Two issues stated by Mr. Weiser 1) This is the first time IMTA has seen the site plan and it did not previously include a west driveway. He noted this is a concern because it brings activity to the west border that IMTA believed the previous site plan had removed, 2) The Commission approve both site plans, because it places IMTA in a bad negotiation situation with the State and doesn't give IMTA certainty as to what will happen to the property in front of IMTA.

Director Anderson stated we want IMTA to understand that as long as the State receives the agreement; our intent is to exercise the exchange and move forward with that. Mr. Weiser stated it is IMTA's intent to see that IMTA acquire that property with the trade. We will negotiate appropriately on this.

Chairman Oakley outlined the potential action the Commission can take: 1) The Commission could adopt a motion to combine the alternatives of Proposal A and B in one motion – both approve the original site plan as originally proposed and also approve the site plan contingent upon the agreement the State is negotiating with IMTA, 2) Or the Commission can approve either one of those separately. Chairman Oakley reminded everyone he will abstain from voting.

Chairman Oakley states he understands IACCT is willing to go ahead with its original site plan including the triangular piece or it is also willing to go ahead with the forty-five foot movement to the east.

Director Anderson stated if the State cannot reach an agreement with IMTA to exchange this parcel of land, they are not interested in owning a small triangular piece. The State has been clear with IMTA that they don't want two parcels of land to take care of.

Scott Weiser noted the issue of the driveway is the activity, lights, and other things that IMTA objected to previously. Mr. Weiser stated IMTA is interested in the triangular piece of land noting procedural issues need to be addressed.

MOTION - Carl Voss moved to approve the revised site plan which would include exchange of property as outlined and if that does not reach agreement on Friday, October 19, 2007, then we revert to our original site approved in July, 2007. Molly Clause seconded the motion.

Chairman Oakley clarified – that the Commission, if it adopts this, would be recommending proceeding forward on either one of these plans is acceptable to the Commission. The Commission recommends these two site plans are okay. Carl Voss stated the preference for what we are now calling Plan A (revised site plan), that requires a forty-five foot shift and an exchange of property and should that not clear by Friday, October 19, 2007, then we revert to the previously approved Plan B.

Roll call vote. Motion carried unanimously.

Molly Clause (Yes)
Paul Carlson (Yes)
Cathy Brown (Yes)
Scott Brown (Absent)
Brice Oakley (Abstain)
Carl Voss (Yes)
Elizabeth Isaacson (Yes)

Task Force Reports

Draft Policy for Monuments (Monuments and Memorials Task Force). Review of Draft Document, Outstanding Questions, Discussion and Next Steps.

Chairman Oakley stated the Commission is not looking to formally adopt a policy today, this is to set up a process looking to January to be able to recommend a policy to DAS.

Nicholas Smith, DAS/Design & Construction updated the Commission with regard to the work completed thus far on the Monuments and Memorial Policy. Mr. Smith noted at this point, they have taken language from other states that have similar policies to create their own. Comment document (copy attached to minutes) notes issues DAS is trying to work through, it is the opinion that the Commission should work through a lot of these issues and direct DAS staff.

Chairman Oakley noted this is exactly the point the Commission wanted to get to, noting Mr. Smith did a really good job pulling together other states, giving us a draft incorporating some of the Iowa nuances to consider. It was noted Laura Riordan also worked on this project. An example of changes Chairman Oakley would make would be to change the language from major work and minor work to significant impact work (SIW) and minimal impact work (MIW).

Molly Clause stated this is very helpful and noted she appreciated the research that went into this draft document. Ms. Clause stated it has been brought up that it is getting "crowded" by the Civil War Monument. The Capitol Planning Commission may have the right to recommend moving a monument some day, even though it has been there for many years.

Chairman Oakley made two suggestions, 1) This deserves individual Commissioner review. This is done because there are tough decisions to be made and this document is to be a guide for the Commission. A lot of time should be devoted so there is some integrity in the criteria since DAS is going to suggest this go through the Administrative Rules process. The Administrative Procedures Act is very broad and if applying standards it must be guided by something. Please funnel comments to Nicholas Smith. 2) The Chair is going to expand the Committee of Cathy Brown, Carl Voss to include Karen Polking (former chair of the Capitol Planning Commission) and Bruce Williams from Cultural Affairs and Nicholas Smith.

Chairman Oakley noted between now and January this committee will be the appropriate point in exchanging information to then work through any issues and adopt recommendations at the January, 2008 meeting.

Chairman Oakley noted he hoped the Legislative members of this Commission will also consider this document, noting it is really important because it involves Legislative considerations as well, through funding, public policy considerations, etc. The Commission is only a recommendation and our Legislative members can be a very important voice.

Cathy Brown stated she wanted to clarify two key roles the Legislature can assist with. 1) Any nominations for individual memorials would like Legislative feed-back.. 2) There should be a Monument Plan. Ms. Brown stated she would appreciate any written response, etc., from anyone with a position or recommendation on monuments.

Carl Voss commented about memorials to an individual, noting there was just one on the Complex now, the Allison Monument. Wilson Alexander Scott is buried on complex, which was a condition to receive the land the Capitol sits on. The guideline is that a person must be deceased ten years before they could have an individual memorial to a person. Mr. Voss noted this is a starting point and what other states have done. Carl noted memorials could be a tree and if there is a Landscaping Plan, he is unaware of it. Some states have a "grove of trees", if there is something defined as a grove he is not aware of it.

Elizabeth Isaacson stated they must have an “on-going maintenance” as part of it. Noting this is very important. Staff noted there is some of this included in the draft document.

Senator McCoy stated from the Legislative perspective, they will certainly be aware when this issue comes up. From the perspective of getting something down on paper and looking at other states to see what is happening out there, he agrees Senator McCoy stated the Legislature probably would heed whatever the Capitol Planning Commission comes up with. Senator McCoy stated in terms of the funding portion, the Commission would have his commitment to try to get some appropriation so it can proceed and be an effective policy.

Representative Davitt arrived at 9:45 - noted for attendance purposes.

Director Anderson stated in the news the condition of the monuments is noted by people. Director Anderson also noted she has a request from the Jewish Federation to meet with them next week regarding a request to place a Holocaust Memorial which would include ashes. This guidance is extremely important even in its draft stage to help guide that conversation. With the approval of the Commission, Director Anderson asked that she be able to use this draft to give this group some information about what the Commission expects with regard to a monument. They have a monument which they want to move to the Capitol grounds. Director Anderson stated they will photograph it to bring before the Commission. Director Anderson stated this will come before you again, but she wanted to advise the Commission there is a request. Chairman Oakley noted that with the expectation not to take final action on that request until these rules are in place, then it is fine.

Representative Davitt stated his comment on this policy is that it will be a “living document,” setting the standard for what people may discuss a century from now. Representative Davitt also stated he wants the Commission to have “good neighbor policies” and when making changes in the grounds, extend communication with neighbors in the area. Some of these monuments may not affect people as directly as some of the things we have actually addressed in the last several meetings, but a wider information policy would be in order.

Director Anderson noted there is a fair amount of interest from various groups and this policy will add control. Since we have done the West Capitol Terrace the interest has increased.

Dean Ibsen advised the Code Section 18A was the section for Capitol Planning, it has been moved to 8A.367. If you need to see the actual code and don’t find it on the website, please advise.

Mr. Ibsen asked “does the Monument Advisory Committee exist only temporarily?” It is important for the Commission to think about whether this should be a standing committee. Representative Davitt stated he could not imagine this would ever go away; they will be dealing with questions over and over again. Chairman Oakley stated he would expect this would be a Standing Committee of the Commission and probably with some outside membership as well.

Mr. Ibsen stated the task force talked about not only a Monuments Plan but also a Landscape Plan, these could be developed hand-in-hand. Cathy Brown stated the reason for the Landscape Plan would be that it would allow staff to take care of living memorials without having to come

to the Commission. Cathy noted even benches could be included to keep the Commission out of day-to-day events.

Director Anderson commented with regard to the Landscaping Plan, it is important to note that even as West Capitol Terrace was built there is not a Certified Horticulturist on staff. As with buildings, a park is built and then there is not necessarily staff to take care of the park itself. In our Landscape Plan it is important to remember that staffing is an issue because Capitol Grounds with ornate landscaping must also have staffing.

Fountain Report (Fountain Task Force) Update and Next Steps

Cathy Brown advised the task force has not made a lot of progress since the last meeting and will attempt to do that in the near future.

Chairman Oakley stressed it will be important for the Commission to get a concept report. Ms. Brown noted they did get some very good feedback in an informal discussion and need to incorporate and refine those comments. Ms. Brown indicated her intent is to go back to the subcommittee, share the information and make sure the concept paper reflects the input and then share with the Commission. Chairman Oakley stated a concept paper with a specific idea, not a design of a fountain but the kind of messaging plus the funding plan would be helpful.

Chet Guinn with the Peace Group stated their view is that they don't have an answer to what the monument would look like, only that it had a peace connotation. He stated their responsibility is simply to raise the money and how the message gets across, the Commission can decide. Although they would like to have some input and possibly make some suggestions. Rev. Guinn stated they wanted to somehow recognize all those who in the past, the present and the future have worked for peace. It is a very general concept. Rev. Guinn stated a timeline would be useful to his group since they want to get started raising money.

Director Anderson stated it would be helpful in terms of communicating to the Governor's office, if there was a letter from this group expressing their intent to raise the money. Chairman Oakley asked Rev. Guinn for a concept letter.

Cathy Brown, chair of the Fountain Committee, stated she would like to think we will have guidelines within the next six months or sooner. Director Anderson stated the fountain is in the West Capitol Terrace plan, it is still vacant and until it's ready it isn't going anywhere. Director Anderson also offered to help to guide the Peace Group with what they are looking for and want to make certain to provide the needed assistance to meet the Committee needs.

Carl Voss stated his recollection that before the Peace Group came forward there was discussion about the next Legislative session; they were going to hopefully move forward to request allocation of money for a state funded fountain. It was noted it is a part of the '09 request.

Director Anderson stated that when there is guidance from the Commission about what the Fountain Guidelines look like, one thing that will be helpful in fundraising is visuals and those visuals do not come without a price tag. She stated if they do not have an appropriation, perhaps the group would be willing to raise money for the visuals and the visuals will help guide the

fundraising efforts. It might be helpful if they are open to not only funding the fountain but perhaps the visuals.

Chairman Oakley stated we are not that far yet, and to appreciate where the Commission is. The Commission has the concept, and were the first to come forward and they are really happy about that but at this point have to establish some framework in which to make decisions. Chairman Oakley stated in January the Commission will have a comprehensive report from the Committee so they might want to have someone from their group attend the meeting.

Capitol Complex Monuments

Shattering Silence Update. Consideration of Alternative Sites and Next Steps

Director Anderson advised she was pleased to note that Brice Oakley, Mark Johnson and I met with the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to discuss the possible location by the Judicial Building and received clear guidance from them about the sculpture. It is clear that the Chief Justice has very strong feelings about what is appropriate in that area. The conclusion is, they are willing to have the monument in the vicinity of the Judicial Building. The location is West of the Japanese Bell at the crest of the sledding hill. The idea they are proposing would be in line with the sidewalk line in front of the Japanese Bell, directly in line with the sidewalk in the center of the crest of the hill. Director Anderson noted that is the recommendation.

David Boyd, on behalf of the Supreme Court, noted this is an appropriate sculpture and the purpose is appropriate to be on this side of the Capitol Complex and campus. He stated they certainly support efforts to help unify this portion of the campus with the rest of the campus. They hope there is some type of viaduct or something to make access across Court Avenue available again

Chairman Oakley asked if it were fair to summarize the Chief Justice's comment as west of the Japanese Bell as an appropriate location. Mr. Boyd noted there were trees in the area which would also provide a backdrop and look very nice.

James Ellwanger stated he is happy with the new proposed location and stated he believed the people with the monument are very pleased. He thinks the location is better than it was previously. He stated they want to get started as soon as they can.

Chairman Oakley asked DAS, if the Commission were to approve that area as the general area of location, wouldn't they then have to have a specific site plan and more detail to say, yes, that specific piece of ground and that specific configuration?

Mr. Ellwanger stated they would basically have to start over and redo some drawings, which is fine. He stated it has to be seen before actually putting it up. He will start the ball rolling again with different drawings.

Director Anderson noted that the site can support a sculpture of this size, stating she believes there is a lot of fill on that side of the campus. She stated they will have to work with the artist and Dean Ibsen's group to ensure that all of that has been considered. Chairman Oakley stated since this involves an expense, it is important that the Commission take a definitive position with regard to the general area and general configuration of the art, etc.

Representative Watts' stated if the sculpture is oriented correctly, it would be seen from any area in downtown, it would be a very prominent location and more appropriate on the Judicial side of the campus. Chairman Oakley stated it was Representative Watts' suggestion that lead in that direction, noting it was a good idea.

Representative Davitt asked if the discussion in the placement of statutory, etc was set. Chairman Oakley noted the Commission agreed a couple meetings ago that while undertaking the Monument and Memorial process, it would be appropriate to go ahead with this particular one since it has been before the Commission for an extensive period of time,. Noting, it was "in the works", as opposed to others that are not. Chairman Oakley noted they have done the same with the Workers' Monument and the Submarine Monument. Representative Davitt requested a couple lathes be put in the ground showing the area to visually have an understanding of how large the sculpture would be. Chairman Oakley stated this would be resolved as they do their boring tests and engineering steps. (Aerial photo of area attached to minutes).

MOTION: Elizabeth Isaacson made the motion to approve placing the Shattering Silence Sculpture within the circled area on the aerial photo west of the Japanese Bell on the crest of the hill. Cathy Brown seconded the motion.

Cathy Brown stated she would like to clarify because Director Anderson talks about shifting it left or right, etc., noting how it sits on the site, how we approach it, the walkways, etc., we would like the artist to be attentive to.

Paul Carlson clarified, the Commission is approving the concept and the general location subject to review and approval of the specific site. Chairman Oakley stated this is correct, that is the motion.

Roll call vote. Motion carried.

Molly Clause (Yes)
Paul Carlson (Yes)
Cathy Brown (Yes)
Brice Oakley (Yes)
Carl Voss (Yes)
Elizabeth Isaacson (Yes)

Workers' Monument Update

Overview of Final Plans, 28E Agreement and Construction Schedule.

Director Anderson advised the Commission they are concerned about their request for names, recognizing donations that have been received. Jerry Addy is not here today to speak to this. Mr. Addy has submitted a picture of the name plate they would like to use to recognize the various people who donated and there is concern that it will take away from the monument itself.

Mark Johnson talked with Jerry Addy about the naming issue noting he wants to talk with others about the naming issues. The issue did come up with the West Capitol Terrace project and concerns about whether it was individuals or organizations, corporate donors, etc., so there were

some restrictions placed by adopted Legislation. They want to have that discussion with this monument as well to make sure everyone understands with respect to naming issues.

Cathy Brown asked that this information be conveyed back to the Commission since she would like that to be addressed in the policy and she would like to understand the history.

Director Anderson noted it is a lot of names and the concern is he has separate plaques that he wanted. Cathy Brown stated she would share this concern and noted it is inconsistent with some of our previous discussions. Ms. Brown noted she would be open, as a Commissioner, adding they had resolved this on campus (Iowa State), at different points in time by saying “within departmental space”, noting she did not know Mr. Addy’s relationship to a building and to a department. Example would be a conference room that a department had put a plaque there. Director Anderson added this simply underscores the importance of the work the Commission is doing. Director Anderson stated she didn’t know if Mr. Addy in fundraising actually committed to recognition of the people who donated.

Chairman Oakley suggested a review of the minutes, to see what was included in the discussion, what was actually approved and then go forward with a decision. Carl Voss added Mr. Addy spoke about this Monument at a lot of meetings and he never heard about recognition plaques or recognition pavers. Mr. Voss stated this is new. Director Anderson stated they will review the minutes and call Mr. Addy to advise him of the recollections and suggest that if this creates problems with funds he has raised he needs to come before the Commission to discuss the issue.

Mark Johnson noted with respect to the West Capitol Terrace, there was a specific act of Legislation and a resolution that resulted in the ability to fundraise and have names associated with the various trees and benches but it was limited to schools, non-profit organizations and individuals.

Dean Ibsen stated the Workers’ Monument Committee came back to us with final drawings for review including the plaques. We reviewed the rest of the concept drawings; everything is great aside from the plaque issue. The 28E Agreement is being finalized. They are ready to go; they would like to start construction this fall. They have a dedication ceremony set for April 28, 2008. Chairman Oakley stated if they move ahead, they need to know this question is out there. Chairman Oakley noted he assumed DAS would want guidance from the Commission in that regard and that would not come before January.

Paul Carlson stated as far as moving ahead is concerned; until a decision has been made they need to be informed that putting a plaque on the monument has not been approved. Chairman Oakley stated if they want to start building it with the risk that it may have no plaques, that is up to them. They need to know that there is some risk, at this Commission’s standpoint, it’s still reviewing that issue and it may not come to pass as far as our role is concerned.

Bicycles and Bicycle parking on Capitol Complex

Carl Voss stated the “Bike Parking Policy & Regulation” was sent out yesterday so many may not have had time to review. Mr. Voss advised he received help from Tim Lane with Public

Health and Angela Dalton with the Citizens Aid Ombudsman's office to prepare the draft and policy regarding bicycle parking on the Capitol Complex.

Guidelines on the three pages entitled "Bicycle Parking" came from the Council on Governments in the Denver area, these are guidelines adopted by the City of Des Moines in regard to bicycle parking, how much bicycle parking is appropriate, the design and specifications of bike racks, and the space in the bike racks. This policy recommends a "U" shaped bike rack that is in common usage and easy to park two bikes at each bike rack, assuming those bike racks are for short term parking, like someone coming to a Capitol Planning Commission meeting. They are also requesting additional parking for state employees that would be secure and covered. The preference would be inside parking but if there is no inside parking available they are suggesting bike lockers. The guidelines on the amount of bike lockers for the number of employees are adopted from the St. Paul, Minnesota campus. Mr. Voss stated he would suggest that one approach would be a "Pilot Program" with a building or group of buildings with some secure bicycle parking. The attachment suggests several sources of funding for bicycle enhancements. DAS staff can review those and see if there are any programs that could help as a source of funding. At this point, this has not been reviewed by DAS staff because of staff allocation; there was not anyone available to help prepare this.

Mr. Voss suggested DAS could do this as a "receive and file" and then someone on staff could help and come back to the Commission in January with a proposal for the entire Commission... Mr. Voss noted that maybe they would want to take a look at a bike-walker program; there is a grant application that would have to be done by the end of November.

Director Anderson stated she would like Paul Carlson and Dean Ibsen to look at the proposal and determine an appropriate response or plan of action based upon the suggestions. There is a significant amount of work that Carl Voss has done on this and should be to recognized as an interest in this issue and the Department of Health has significant interest as well. Director Anderson stated she would also like to check with IGOV to see if they have comments on this proposal as well.

Paul Carlson asked if Carl Voss had any idea how many active riders are on complex. Mr. Voss advised in the height of summer all of the racks at the Hoover Building are full (12 bikes). Mr. Voss added that in St. Paul the more bike racks and bike lockers they install, the more people ride. People want to make sure that their bikes are secure before they are willing to ride. St. Paul has had a very successful program. DART has bike racks on their buses. In August, there were 3200 bikes loaded on buses. The number one reason why people don't bike to work is that they don't have a secure place to lock their bike.

Chairman Oakley stated the discussion and the interest the department has shown shows there are others interested in it and asked staff to continue to pursue this item. Chairman Oakley stated he agrees with Mr. Voss, demand and usage will follow, it is just human nature. Chairman Oakley asked that this topic be on the January agenda.

Capitol Requests/Five Year Modernization Plan for Capitol Complex

Dean Ibsen distributed the final format in terms of rankings as it went to the Department of Management. This document goes through many levels of review, the Vertical Infrastructure

Advisory Committee offers comments, Administrative Services offers comments, the Department of Management will be looking at it and different buying teams will be looking at it as it goes to the Governor's office for possible inclusion in the Governor's Budget Request to the Legislature.

At the last meeting there was discussion that perhaps a group within the Capitol Planning Commission should look at this specifically with the filter of what is the Capitol Planning Commission's interest. From Administrative Services standpoint, the entire complex and the key issues in terms of functionality, improvements that need to be made, aesthetic issues, are all incorporated in this. Also the other agencies we work with, Human Services, Corrections, and others around the State have been getting appropriations for major maintenance and routine maintenance which are distributed to other agencies through another prioritization process.

The way they prioritize this is to think about health, life and safety issues as well as projects that have already been funded and are under way. Numbers one thru eleven – would be high priority from Administrative Services standpoint in terms of life, health and safety. Numbers twelve through nineteen, need to be done, they could probably get by if need be. Numbers twenty and twenty-one are really aesthetic improvements that would be great but are a lower priority.

The Vertical Infrastructure Advisory Committee met last Thursday and reviewed requests from twelve agencies and divisions across the state including these projects. They are now going to sort through all of the projects, look at them from the filter of Vertical Infrastructure Executive Order # 3, which is how do we maintain the existing buildings that we have. Over the next few weeks they will be sorting all of those projects in the priority order. Generally something like the Court Avenue Bridge would fall off of the radar screen. They will be meeting on November 8, 2007 and making their recommendations to the Governor at that point.

It may be appropriate for this Commission to include recommendations of specific projects that could be included in the Annual Report that goes to the Legislature.

Chairman Oakley stated one way to look at this, in regard to the Master Plan, the Annual Report needs to feed off of the Master Plan, recognizing that the Master Plan needs to be updated. The priorities of the Department with regard to the impact on the Master Plan are different from ours. Example – upgrading electrical distribution systems are important needs but from the charge given to the Capitol Planning Commission it would probably not be one of the priorities. The Capitol Planning Commission's priorities seem to be the impact on significant buildings, the aesthetics, viaducts, etc as opposed to infrastructure fire safety things. Chairman Oakley stated his list would be some of those, maybe some restoration work, more aesthetic work or the viaduct. As the Commission looks at this, in doing the Annual Report, they would look at it somewhat differently.

Chairman Oakley stated the minutes should reflect the Commission has received the FY2009 5-Year Infrastructure Plan for the Dept. of Administrative Services, have been informed on it and the Commission will develop its own most critical projects. This will be used in conjunction with the other items in preparing the Capitol Planning Annual Report.

Construction Update

Parking Lot Improvements

Work is nearly finished on parking lots # 1 & # 2 (on either side of the Hoover Building), Lot # 3 (Across Court Avenue), Lot # 14 & #19 (southeast corner of the Capitol complex) and Lot # 6 (south of the Capitol). The most transforming one will be Lot # 6 which reflects the Master Plan in terms of layout versus just a blacktop surface area. There is a sacrifice of some parking spaces, but it is going to be important to the look of the Complex. They have been in the process of outlining the next phase of parking lot work. There are a number of issues particularly along the North side of the campus, so they have not finalized the list of the next round of parking lot improvements. Lot # 10 near Workforce Development is high on the list, there is funding in place to do another round of parking lot work which will start in the Spring.

Capitol Building Interior and East Steps

The rotunda has been restored, almost finished, a great improvement. The East Steps including electrical work is almost finished.

West Capitol Terrace Phase 2

The project is in the design phase. The completion date is targeted for between May 1, 2008 and the Triathlon in June, 2008. Phase 2, is Finkbine Street and then plantings and outcroppings and sidewalks running east and west off of the main area. Director Anderson stated events have increased dramatically on the West Capitol Terrace.

Newly Funded Miscellaneous Construction Projects

Funding has been received for HVAC improvements in the Hoover Building and some work at the Maintenance Plant.

New Office Building/Parking Structure and New IUB/OCA Building update

IUB/OAC has completed the programming phase. The square footage is more than originally estimated. The cost is being evaluated and will be updated later. Chairman Oakley noted the Commission was going to take up as actions item the site selection, etc., at this meeting. Mr. Ibsen advised they are not ready for that yet.

New Office Building

Director Anderson advised the site location for the new State Office Building has not changed. Discussions continue with Mercy Capitol with regard to the acquisition. The idea of the possible usage of the Mercy Capitol Hospital has changed and there is a meeting scheduled for Tuesday (October 23, 2007) on the Mercy Capitol Hospital acquisition. Once they have determined if they can purchase the property then the parking lot location will be decided.

Mr. Ibsen stated programming sessions have begun with Agriculture and DNR in terms of determining space needs and the number of people on complex in the Wallace Building and leased space. The schematic design will start in January and he stated they believe the building will be completed in 2011. A parking study has begun to look at parking needs primarily on the North Complex, the use of the existing parking structure, the impact of the parking structure that is intended to be built with the new office building and the impact on the rest of the complex. Our design team for the new office building includes Walter Parking Consultants out of Minneapolis.

Director Anderson stated there is discussion of the new state office building with regard to elected official use. If elected officials plan to be a part of the new office building it is really a legislative discussion and the size, the tenure, the grade of it would be affected. Director Anderson noted they will be in a better position at the next meeting to give an update on that discussion as well as an update on the Mercy Capitol Hospital and its possible use and the impact on the entire campus.

Chairman Oakley suggested that an artist (not an architect) be involved in the building planning. DOT and other agencies have done it and to put an artist on the team (remembering ½ of 1% of the cost of the building has to go into public art by law) is to want to do it right. Director Anderson stated they have had discussions with the Department of Cultural Affairs about that. Dean Ibsen stated the IUB/OCA Building already has an art committee more or less formed, they have met with Bruce Williams from Cultural Affairs, visited Iowa State and that process is underway. Mr. Ibsen stated that same process will be used for the new office building.

Director Anderson stated there is considerable interest, including the Governor, about the energy efficiency of the new office building and if it should be at a Silver, Platinum or Gold level. Director Anderson noted that the first pass at the appropriation for the new state office building \$77 million is well below what it will take to build a 350,000 square foot building which was the original intent.

Visitors Center – Carl Voss asked for an update.

Director Anderson stated we have had discussions with Mid-America regarding interest, but at the current time there are so many issues, this one is moved back. There is interest in the concept but, West Capitol Terrace is first, resolution of the three buildings at the base of the hill second and figuring out the Fleet Building and the new state building are ahead of that.

Capitol Planning Commission Annual Report for 2007

Chairman Oakley stated the annual report is one of the major tasks over the next couple months. Dean Ibsen noted members have received the report issued last year, this shows the general format. Some people describe it as a marketing piece that summarizes the activities of the Planning Commission. Mr. Ibsen stated when he came on board he suggested a more detailed document and the members at the time did not want that much detail. The other thing discussed is making it a meaningful piece that is available in January; this one went out in April. They are looking for some direction from the Commission, maybe a group that can work with staff in the next couple months to look at both the format of the report as well as the recommended projects to include in the report in terms of the five year plan and help to put it together to have something that could be finalized at the January meeting and out the door before February 1st.

Chairman Oakley stated this is a good plan noting it would be appropriate to appoint a committee. Chairman Oakley noted he would like to see it look to 2010 and include what is being done on the Master Plan, importance of the Master Plan and possibly include some projections out to 2015 to 2020. The Master Plan needs to be addressed in this, including the appropriation for it. Capitals priority, the Monuments and Memorial Policy, the whole north campus area noting decisions by Legislature and the Governor is a real high priority and should be done timely and in conjunction with each other.

Chairman Oakley noted the general format of the document has served well. Director Anderson suggested something never talked about in this document is the value of the assets that this group helps manage, the acreage, some basic facts about the Capitol Complex and the buildings we manage noting this helps illustrate the importance of the work of this Commission as well as the money that we spend on leasing off campus. Director Anderson stated there are 155 leases, \$8 million dollars in rentals in the Polk County area and that helps to underscore long term planning to ensure that the citizens are getting the best return. .

Chairman Oakley suggested the possibility of a format of Frequently Asked Questions. Chairman Oakley stated he likes to say the State Capitol Building is Iowa's largest art treasure. Molly Clause added she would like the report to bring out the continued growing use of the Capitol Complex. Director Anderson noted it is a marketing piece as well in terms of educating everyone about the future needs. Chairman Oakley asked Commission members to take a look at this and asked for e-mail traffic with ideas noting he would like to have a draft document for members around the first of December. Send your e-mails to Dean Ibsen and copy Chairman Oakley. Chairman Oakley advised the Governor personally and his office in general takes a lot of interest in what we do on the Commission.

Representative Davitt stated he has asked the leaders in the House and the Senate to consider making the State Capitol a "wireless free zone", particularly as it relates to the children that come to observe the Legislature or activities taking place in the Capitol. Representative Davitt suggested a web-site, noting he has talked to the computer people about whether they would make available a Pod-Cast or self-guided tour to download to your phone or I-Pod and walk around the building with a self-guided tour and downloadable PDF on the history of the Capitol. Representative Davitt stated it is becoming more common in some public and private spaces and he noted a web-site for the whole Capitol area would do a lot for our publicity.

Representative Watts stated he thought this was a tremendous idea. Representative Watts noted for the Annual Report that "shorter is better", if you want the Legislators to read it, you better make it brief and to the point.

Other Business

Next Meeting – Date to be Determined; however it should be before January 14, 2008 (1st Day of Session)

It was noted if there needs to be a special meeting for any issues that will be scheduled.

Meeting Adjourned

Respectfully submitted
Nancy Williams, DAS/GSE